

Theological
Mr. BATE's ANSWER

TO

Dr. *Sharp's* Two Dissertations

ANSWERED:

Being a VINDICATION of the
Etymology and Scripture-Meaning

OF

ELOHIM and BERITH.

By GEORGE KALMAR, E. *K*

Deduct what is but vanity, —
Or Learning's Luxury, or Idleness;
Or tricks to shew the stretch of human brain,
Mere curious pleasure, or ingenious pain.

Whatever warms the heart or fills the head,
As the mind opens and its functions spread,
Imagination plies her dang'rous art,
And pours it all upon the peccant part.

A. POPE's *Ess. on Man*, E. II. y 45—48. 141—144.

L O N D O N,

Sold by W. SANDBY in Fleet-street,

MDCCCL.



A N S W E R

A N S W E R E D, &c.

IN the following few *pages*, I am concerned with Mr. *Bate*, who styles himself *Page 22*, a *sanguine Hutchinsonian*; and declares, *p. 23*—“ He is not so much enquiring into the *strict meaning of the words*, as what Roots “ they belong to ; and what part of speech they “ are of.” And *p. 108*—“ He neither pretends “ to know, nor thinks it worth while to en- “ quire after, &c.”

If he be not so much enquiring into the *strict meaning of the words*, &c. with what conscience did he venture to entitle his book—the *scripture meaning of Aleim and Berith justified?*

Page 10—“ Had learned men given a *satisfactory account* how a Name of God could “ be taken from, or given us under the idea of “ *curfing*, I believe, I may say, it never would “ have been controverted whether אלה as a

A 2

“ verb,

“ verb, was a different root with אלה the Name
“ of God.”

Mr. *H—n* is thought to have been a *learned man*, and his *account* how a Name of God could be taken from, or given us under the idea of *curſing*, is pretended to be *ſatisfactory* too ; but for all that, it is controverted whether אלה as a verb be the ſame root with אלה the Name of God. And *I may ſay*, no *learned man* can ever give a *ſatisfactory account* how &c; therefore it will for ever be *controverted* whether, &c. From hence it plainly appears, that what is ſaid afterwards is precarious—“ And here let
“ me aſk what can it be ſuppoſed ſhould induce
“ inſpired and infallible Writers, to write in this
“ uncertain manner, ſo liable to deceive others,
“ as to give ſo widely different and oppoſite ſen-
“ ſes, to the ſame words?”

Petitiſo Principii.

And what the *Scripturarian* (or *ſcripture philoſopher*, who maketh the Scripture the ground even of *philophy* and *mathematicks* &c.) ſays a little before, is allowed, and may be *with great propriety retorted upon him*:
— “ The *verb* and *noun* will always be ſuppoſ-
“ ed to have the ſame meaning, or original
“ ſenſe, *unleſs ſome particular reaſon appear to*
“ *the contrary.*”

And again the *Scripturarian* aſks—“ Did not
“ *they* know &c. that ſome would from thence
“ take a *bundle* to make a *noſe of wax* of the
“ *whole Word of God*, that *uncertainty* cannot
“ be

“ be *foundation of faith?*” I retort upon him too, and answer—*Turpe est doctori quem culpa redarguit ipsum.*

This *Script—n* says, *p.* 32, 33—“ It is a
 “ Position of Mr. *H—n*’s that every Root in
 “ *Hebrew* has but *one* meaning or idea belong-
 “ ing to it, or that no one word has *two* mean-
 “ ings; nor any *two* words the *same* mean-
 “ ing.” — Every root in *Hebrew* hath but
 one ruling idea, or no one word hath *two*
primitive meanings; nor any two words the
same primitive meaning. Otherwise that Posi-
 tion must be false, as it is contradicted too, *p.*
106, lin. 27. and elsewhere. And Mr. *B—* be-
 ing blinded with this *Position*, maketh him, like
 one who cannot at all see, or help himself, cry
 out in such manner as *p.* 109—“—If the holy
 “ Spirit’s Words have not always the same, but
 “ often very different, and sometimes *quite con-*
 “ *trary* meanings, there can be no certainty or
 “ perspicuity in writing.”

I think, my *Reply to Mr. Aboab’s Remarks upon Dr. Sharp’s Dissertations*, serves for a proper answer to this *Script—n*’s arguing, from *p.* 14 to 27, against the distinction betwixt אלה and the other radical verb אלה: therefore let him look at it as soon as it cometh out. But there are some few things, that deserve a particular examination. He, in order to shew there is nothing like two different *roots* in אלה with a *changeable* ה, and אלה with an unvariable one, and

and to prove, that there is no such thing, as the unchangeableness of ה in גנה, which is produced by Dr. *Sharp* as a parallel verb to אלה, the true root of אלה, instances *p.* 15, from *Ezek.* i. 18, x. 12, גנתם, גנהם; and adds—"Which" is a *pretty plain proof*, that גנתם, in one place, is גנהם of the others: tho' in one the ה is changed into ת." The former part is true; but the latter will appear false presently: He cannot but confess, that גניהן (used in the very same verse with גנתם) is the same with גנהם *gabbihem*; wherein the jod the characteristic of the *masculine plural*, is suppressed, as well as the ו, the characteristic of the *feminine plural*, is in גנתם *Jabbotham* (but here the ת keeps still the place of one of the characteristics of the plural (ות). If then גנתם and גנהם be plural, as Mr. B—himself acknowledges; it cannot be thought, that either the ת, in the former, is changed from ה, or the ה, in the latter, is a *radical letter*; because the ו and ו, the characteristics of the plural, either stand always after the last radical, or keep sometimes the place of it. One could make an exception, that גנתם, and גנהם are in the *singular* number rather, than in the plural (for they may be justly questioned, because of their characteristic's being concealed: Nay, I suspect, that Mr. B—taketh them for a *singular*, as far as I can see *p.* 15, *l.* 28). The reply would be ready by way of retorting upon him—The ה in *regimine*, even according to his own acknowledgment,

knowledge, is changed into ת; but in גנהם, tho' it be *in regimine*, the ה is not changed, therefore it is an *unchangeable* one.

According to which reason the ה, in גנהם, would be a *radical*; and the ה, in גנתם, now changed into ת, would be either merely *heë-mantic*, or a *radical* letter, but a *variable* one. But indeed *both* of them come from גבב *Heb.* and *Chald.* (and in *Arabic* is גבב *gabb*) not from גבה; and to this answers another *Arabic* verb גבה: the last letter of which admits of no change in that language, any more than the ה does in the *Heb.* גבה.

Mr. B— instances, p. 16. אנהו, נהו, which, he thinks, retain the ה, which in other instances is changed or dropped intirely. But, as he himself owns, that the ה (mutable) *in regimine* is changed into ת, there are eleven places, wherein the ה in נה, being *in regimine*, is not altered at all; as Jer. xxxi. 23, l. 7, נה צדק, *mansio iustitiae*, &c. Upon this account I presume to make the same distinction between נה and נה, as between אלה and אלה. נה with a mutable ה, coincides with the *Arab.* ناه, also with נאה; but נה with an immutable ה must be the same with another *Ar.* נה. Then the former properly signifies *immorari*, &c. an *habitation* wheresoever, whether in a tent, &c. or without it. And if it signifies ever an *house* or *tent*, it is a metonymical, and consequently, a secondary signification. The latter contrarywise signifies properly *elatum fuit, eminuit aedificium*; so an *house*,

house, &c. and metonymically an *inhabitation*; but in *an house*, &c. not in any place without it. So widely then they differ. *אנוהו*, *נורו* come from the latter.

His instancing *ibid.* these words, *מעשה*, *ינה*, *יעלה*, *תלהו* is nothing to the purpose; because those are not in such cases, wherein the ה ordinarily is, or must be, dropt.

He says, *p.* 17,—“In the produced instances, “the ה looks as *immutable* as it doth in *אלהים*, “and *he* should be glad to know, what distinction can be laid down, which will take in “the one and leave out the other.” Not to say more; I ask only, whether could he from the above instanced verbs derive or form such *plural participles* as, *עשהים*, *עלהים*, &c. (instead of *עשים*, *עלים*, viz. *עליים עשיים*), as well as we do *אלהים*, *גבהים* from *אלה*, *גנה*?

And a little before, he says—“There is a “plain Reason to be given why *אלה* should retain its ה in the *plural masculine*: because “otherwise it would have been unavoidably “confounded with *אליים*, the *plural* of *אל*: “for *אליים* and *אליים* would have been so “alike, that they could not have been known “asunder.”

From my *question* just propounded it is as evident as can be, that from the root *אלה*, which now stands in our imperfect *Hebrew Lexicons*, and from which the learned *Alb. Schultens* deduces the noun *אל*, there can by no means be deduced such *plural participle* as, *אלהים*, but such, *אליים*, viz. *אליים*: Then *אליים* whether it be

be the *plural* of the noun אל (in which the ה is dropt) or of the *participle* אלה, cannot but be plainly and necessarily distinguished from אלהים, which is derived from another quite different *root* not now extant in *Hebrew Lexicons*, but preserved still in the *Arabic* tongue, viz. אלה.

He urges *p.* 17—19, that אלי, in *Joël* i. 8, is not deduced from אלה, and says *p.* 18 —“ He “ shall set aside אלי then a verb from אלה, because *Nature*, *Grammar*, and the context are “ on his side.” I cannot see in what respect our translation of אלי is against *Nature*. But what a monstrous *Grammar* in *Hebrew* is this he proposes, “ אלי כבתולה *There is lamentation “ like a virgin’s*”? And what over-nice *origination* is this—“ א a! לי me! being put together (אלי) may be a word for Woe or Lamentation?”

As for the *context*: It is true, in this *chapter* the *Prophet* speaks to *all the inhabitants of the land*, and uses every where (*Ÿ* 2, 3, 5, 11, 13, 14) an *imperative verb* of the *plural number*, excepting, that all our interpreters render *Ÿ* 8, in the *singular*,—*lament like a virgin*; but they take it as being addressed *collectively*, to the *nation of Judah*. I am indifferent about it, whether it be *collectively* spoken, or in the *plural*, like the *other verbs*: but if one should insist that the *latter* is more suitable to the context, I should perhaps be inclined to think, that instead of אלי there should be אלו; since not only

the י is often changed into ו, but likewise the ו into י, by *corruption*.

According to this reasoning too, אלה, whose *plural imperative* is אלו, is to be distinguished from the other root אלה, whose *plural imperative* must be אלהו.

Mr. B— seems to flatter himself a little, saying, p. 19—“ But the point about אלי as a “ *Verb* derived from אלה, is entirely given up “ by fetching it from the *Arabic* אל; for if it “ come from the *Arabic* אל, it is not from the “ *Hebrew* אלה, and so the *Arabic note* (viz. “ that of the Doctor’s, p. 15.) is in direct con- “ tradiction to the reasoning in the *book* itself.” I answer— One of the *senses* of אלה, viz. *gemuit, eiulavit, exclamavit prae dolore*, is borrowed from the *Arabic* אל or אלל; but its other sense, viz. *iuravit, &c.* exactly corresponds with the *Arabic* אלו, or אלי *strinxit, iuramento obstrinxit, &c.* According to both which etymologies the ה in the *Hebrew* אלה sometimes is *dropt*, and sometimes is *changed* into *another* letter.

I must now observe (and I beg the Reader would do so too), that this *Script—n* I am concerned with is no less either unjust or unskilled in the very *Grammar*, than rash and zealous in a phantastic and subtile metaphysical manner of interpreting the *Scripture*. It is only fit to be laughed at what he says, p. 19,—“ He thinks “ that אליית (in *Jud.* xvii. 2.) is *Hiphil*, because “ the *Jod*, in the *third order*, as appears by the “ *Grammars* and usage, is the sign of *Hiphil*.”
What

What an instance of gross ignorance is here ! I wonder he did not chuse to be informed, either by Mr. *Aboab*, or by Mr. *R——e*, or by any *sanguine* Grammarian else, that, beside the *Jod*, the ה, the *characteristic* of the *Hipbil*, is there wanting.

This *sanguine H——nian* goeth on p. 21—23, and because he is *not much enquiring into the strict meaning of the words*, ventures to contradict the very evident *truth*, in explaining 1 Sam. xiv. 24.—“ *The people were distressed that day, for Saul יאל had acted rashly, foolishly, with the people, saying, Cursed be every one that eateth bread till evening.*” True, Saul had *acted rashly*. But this *sanguine H——nian* hath *acted rashly* too with the Scripture, not considering that what is said י 27, 28, השביע, אמת העם charged the people with an oath, is an evident proof that יאל must signify, *adjured*. (He hath *acted rashly* also, asserting, p. 34, l. 6, so manifest a falsehood.) Consequently he is mistaken in affirming, that יאל is the *root* of יאל. And the rather, that the *radical* י, before a *radical* א, never, as far as I have observed, is dropt. But he says—“ the entire dropping of the ה “ helps to confirm it, that יאל, in this place, “ very probably cannot be rendered, *adjured*.” I have said in my *Reply* to Mr. *A—b*, that, were יאל in *Hipbil*, the ה could not be flung away, but ought to stand in stead of the *characteristical Jod* of it. Then יאל is in *Kal*, with the *future tense* of which the ה hath nothing

thing to do: tho' some verbs keep it in the *future*.

I beg leave to *put my Non placet* on what the *Script—n* says p. 23—"The verb לָהֲאֱלֹהִים, " in *I Kings* viii. 31, from אֱלֹהִים, may as well " be called a *noun*, as a *verb* in the *infinitive*. " It hath just the same letters as the *noun*." Nay, it certainly is an *infinitive*. But it is very indifferent to me whether it be or not.

He says p. 23, 24—"There are two passages " in *Hof.* iv. 2, and x. 4, of which the Doctor " says it may justly be doubted whether *they* be " verbs; there seems to me no doubt of their " being nouns. Particularly iv. 2, (which may " be rendered two ways, and either way) אֱלֹהִים " is a *noun* and not a *verb*." Very well! Contrarywise Mr. *Aboab* contends p. 16, 17—"that in those passages (particularly in iv. 2.) " אֱלֹהִים undoubtedly must be a *verb*." So Dr. *Sharp* betwixt them two is *safe*: *Inter duos litigantes tertius gaudet*. Let then the two *sanguine H—nians* quarrel with one another.

So far there appears to be no place for Mr. B—'s conclusion (p. 24.) against this assertion of the *Doctor's*—"אֱלֹהִים is formed like גִּלָּה and " other verbs, which have the mutable ה, and " in all the Instances where it occurs, as a " verb undoubtedly, the ה is wanting." So the *essential difference* contended for betwixt אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים is evident, notwithstanding all the exceptions brought against it. Consequently Mr. B—'s arguing, p. 25, is precarious, groundless, and inconclusive.

Against

Against this Assertion of the *Dr.'s*—"There
 " is no instance to be met with of the *participle*
 " *Pabul* of any irregular verb ending in ה,
 " in which said participle the ה is final," Mr.
B. produces, p. 26, some instances, derived
 from verbs which have what we call the *mu-*
table ה, and yet their *pabul* is ended with ה,
 not with וי: as רואה, ערוה, גאווה, and from *Exam.*
Exam. p. 74, זעוה, נאווה, ריוה. Indeed ריוה and
 רואה are in *Kal Benoni*; and in *pabul* must be
 רוי (as *Esa.* i. 5, *Jer.* viii. 18, *Lam.* i. 22.) and
 רוי, as 1 *Sam.* xxv. 36 (*Chald.*): And all the
 rest are *feminine kal benoni*, or the *third per-*
son of the feminine gender in the perfect tense^a,
 in which case the *third radical* cannot stand
 thus, גאווה, ערוה, זעוה, נאווה, but thus,
 ערויה, גאוויה, נאוויה, or thus, ערויה, גאוויה, &c.
 some of which are not only *verbs*, or *adje-*
ctives, but sometimes *substantive Nouns* too.
 The same I said, in my *Reply*, of ברית, which
 is for ברית or ברות or בראה (cannot stand
 ברהה), from ברא or ברה compared with ברו
 and ברי.

Let again the two *sanguine H——ians* fight
 with one another. Mr. *Aboab*, p. 46, taketh אלה,
 in *Deut.* xxix. 12, 14, for a *victim*; because it
 is construed with כרת: And the other renders
 it, *Execration*. So these two *combatants* de-
 stroying one another, we are pretty *safe*. But
 that we may be still more so; as I have checked
 the *former*, I cannot forbear reproving the *other*

^a Here sometimes the ה is changed into ת, as גלתה for
 גליתה or גלית.

too. He translates that passage, *p. 29*,—"Keep
 " *the words of this Covenant—that thou shouldst*
 " *enter into covenant with the Lord thy God,*
 " *and into his Execration, which the Lord thy*
 " *God maketh with thee this day.—I make this*
 " *covenant and this Execration.*" He says also
p. 28, "the manner of *covenanting* was, that
 " *they took and gave an oath; and bound*
 " *themselves to each other for the perform-*
 " *ance of a covenant or contract.*"

For what reason then is he pleased, in the
 passage just quoted, to render *Execration* ra-
 ther than an *Oath*? In which passage אלה is
 so expressive, that it shews the *covenant* to be
 so much more established, as it is ratified by an
adjuration obliging the people to keep the
 words of the *Covenant*; or, as if it were con-
 firmed by an *oath*: but then *oath* is to be un-
 derstood here *tropically*, not *literally*, being
 put or used for the *covenant* itself. It is true,
 sometime the *covenanters*, binding themselves to
 the performance of the *covenant*, *swear* and use
 such words which imply some idea of a *bann*,
curse, or *execration*: But it cannot be said,
 that they always, or, all the *covenanters* what-
 soever, do so too; therefore it would be most
 improper to think, that אלה must be rendered
execration, wherever and whenever it is used;
 since it doth not express such an *adjuring*, *tak-*
ing an oath, or *swearing*, as would always carry
 with itself the idea of *execrating*; but it signi-
 fies sometimes mere and simple *adjuring*, or,
taking

taking an oath, sometimes cursing, and sometimes both together.

And that Mr. *Bate's* quoting, p. 28, *Deut.* xxvii. 12, and *Jerem.* xi. 3, doth make nothing to that manner of *covenanting*, he urges, will easily appear to any judicious Reader, after I have answered to what he infers from *Deut.* xxix. above propounded. He says, p. 30,—“ It
 “ appears here that God did engage himself as
 “ a Party in the covenant with his People, and
 “ to perform his Part *under an* אלה *execration*
 “ or *curse*.” I answer, tho' God be a Party in the covenant he was, by his goodness, pleased to make with us his people (and however Mr. *Bate* would mitigate the sense of אלה, viz.
 “ we must separate from the word אלה, *exec-*
 “ *cration*, or *curse*, and so from the word

“ *Aleim*, *Execrators* or *Cursers*, that Harsh-
 “ ness or offensive part of the Idea, the word
 “ *Cursing* or *Cursers* gives to the English Ear,
 “ when we use the words as Translations of *A-*
 “ *leim*, as a Name—of God—”), it cannot be said without some degree of impiety, that *Moses* (tho' *Mediator* of the covenant and promulgator of God's law, this and others) had obliged or laid him, who is God and *superior* to him, under an *Execration* or *curse*, however mitigated.

2^{dly}, “ As if the Supreme Being was capable of
 “ any further obligation, than what is con-
 “ ceived to arise from the necessity of his na-
 “ ture, in that *he cannot deny himself*, or be
 “ otherwise than he is.” Let Mr. *Bate* consider the rest too, which the Dr. as a pious Di-
 vine,

vine, discourses, *p.* 41—43, contrary to what Mr. B— says *p.* 37. *l.* 20, 21, and elsewhere.

Mr. B— would forbear saying, *p.* 31— that, in *Gen.* xxiv. 41, *Mealathi* signifies a *Curse*; had he been pleased to cast his eyes on *ŷ* 37. He would also, *p.* 35, forbear rendering, in *Ezek.* xvii. 13, אלה *execration*; had he looked upon the following verses; wherein אלה and ברית explain one another. Let this be compared with what I have said above on *Deut.* xxix. 12, wherein *Alah* and *Brith* are joined. Let it also be compared with *Psalms* cv. 8, 9, 10.

I am indifferent about *Gen.* xxvi. 28.

Let Mr. B— consider what is replied, concerning ברך, to Mr. A—b.

So after all these declarations, *I conceive, with submission, that, the passages cited by Mr. C— make as much for the proof of Aleim from Alah, in his sense and exposition of the Word, as he thought they did: viz. If no more, and, in his sense of &c. and, as he thought; it is nothing but a mere chimera; as well as what is said p.* 42. *l.* 17—20.

Had I time and leisure to urge the contrary to what is contended for, *p.* 38—41; this pamphlet would indeed swell to an immoderate size: therefore I hint only that this *Script—n* is so subtle a Metaphysician and surprizing Mathematician, that he, *p.* 39, seems to conceive *time*, or successive *duration*, to have been *before the world* was: otherwise there could be no room for his imagination of the Holy Trinity's covenanting in the manner he represents.

He

He expresses himself, p. 43, thus — “ It is a
 “ Mistake to say, *That all the people and sub-*
 “ *jects who took Oaths were as properly Aleim,*
 “ *as their Superiors. The people not —.*
 “ Nor was the person whom &c.”

Nay, the people and subjects, who *took oaths*
 must have been *Aleim*, or *Aluim*, even accord-
 ing to Mr. H——n's taking it for a *passive par-*
ticiple, viz. *execrated*, and his rendering *Deut.*
xxix. 12, Thou shouldest enter into God's execra-
tion.

How silly and ridiculous is what Mr. B—
 says—“ Nor was the *person*, whom this *curse*
 “ was denounced upon, *actually* and *really ac-*
 “ *cursed* or *execrated*, and so was not אֱלֹהִים !
 Nay, if any person did not perform the condi-
 tions of the covenant, he was liable to the *pe-*
nalty, viz. obnoxious to the *curse* denounced
 upon him, and so *actually* and *really* was *exe-*
crated (which may be confirmed by what is said
 p. 55, l. 8, 10, *Cursed, is the person who suffers*
the Curse), consequently was אֱלֹהִים. From
 Mr. B.'s account follows also another absurdity
 —God, as he is unalterable, cannot but per-
 form the conditions for his part, or the pro-
 mises he made; therefore he is not *actually ex-*
ecrated, or *liable* to the *penalty* agreed for
 breaking the covenant; consequently he is not
 אֱלֹהִים. *Abfit blasphemia dicto!* For I would have
 said אֱלֹהִים, not אֱלֹהִים.

Further he says—“ The Person whom &c.
 “ — was not אֱלֹהִים; but was נִשְׁבַּע.” This is
 (viz. according to his account of אֱלֹהִים, that it

signifies a Curse, &c.) in direct contradiction to the reasoning in a great part of the book itself; considering, that **נשבע** bears nothing like the sense of cursing or execrating, or being cursed.

Mr. B. is a little hasty, p. 47,—“ Either, he
“ says, the Doctor’s manner of writing is less
“ *perspicuous* than usual, or he contradicts him-
“ self, saying—*Tho’ Elohim should be a deriva-*
“ *tive from the root אלה, it may not take its*
“ *meaning from the verb in Kal, but the verb*
“ *in Hiphil.*” I say myself the same, viz. E-
lohim should be derived from the *Kal Alah* (not
as it signifies, *to swear*, or *denounce a Curse*, but)
as it denotes, *adjure*, which is no less *transitive*
than the *Hiphil* is used in the Bible; (whereas
oftentimes the very *Hiphil* is no more *extensive*
or *expressive*, than the *Kal* is). But the Dr.
doth not allow that *supposition*, and much less
the thing granted by that *supposition*.

From what I answered a little before, what
to Mr. B. seems to be *obscure*, l. 17—21, cannot
but be *plain*.

How quick, or nice and witty is he at the
bottom of this page! Let him know, that when
we say, *some* or other word is not extant now
in the *Hebrew* tongue, or the *Hebrew* Lexicons;
we mean, it is not to be met with in the pre-
sent scanty remains of the *Hebrew* Language,
but is in the *Arabic*.

There is a manifest contradiction p. 48, l. 27,
31, 32, and p. 49, l. 9 — “ The Elohim can
“ make a covenant each with the others, and
“ *swear*

“*swear to each other; but they do not bind themselves to each other.*”

This is what is so largely spoken to in the course of this book, viz. whosoever swears to another, binds himself to him, and particularly in the manner of covenanting, p. 28.

Page 49. l. 9. 10 — “*The Elohim do not swear to their Subjects.*”

Did not they *swear* to the Patriarchs, &c. ?

Mr. B. is not well pleased (p. 50) with what the Dr. says — “*The Promises or Oath seem to have no place before the world.*”

Mr. B. then deserves the rebuke I charged him before with, upon his p. 39. How gross and rude he is, appears, since he not only doth not approve of the Doctor’s right explanation of the *Pact* and *Covenant* (*Promises* and *Oath*) of God, p. 50, l. 30—35; but goeth on p. 51, and asks such a question, *which gives just cause of offence.*

His Answer (p. 54) to the Doctor’s objection brought from p. 45, is no more satisfactory than if it were (and even it looks like) what our Philosophers would style *argumentum a baculo ad angulum*. “If אלה is a *Curse*, and it was customary, by way of confirmation of their *Covenants*, to say, *Let those be cursed* who do not keep them; then *Aleim*, will be, as it is a *personal noun*, persons who have so said. And *Aloah* will be, as it is a *Participle passive*, a *person cursed*; one who is *made*, or to be *made a curse.*”

It is, as far as I can see here and in the two next pages, quite a *new scheme*: to wit, *Aleim*, being in *Kal-Benoni*, denotes *Cursers*, those who *denounce a Curse*, and *Aloah* being in *Pabul-Kal*, signifies *cursed*; so that the *Three Persons* in *Trinity* can be said *Aleim*; and the second person is not only comprehended therein, but is also styled (which neither of the other is) *Aloah*. Consequently, perhaps, there is in the *Bible* neither a *plural* for *Aloah*; nor a *singular* for *Aleim*. If this be Mr. B—'s scheme; he indeed, who with some others reads אלהים, *Aleim*, may go on with it pretty well: but, since, even of his own side, there are others who read it *Alohim*, or *Elohim*, as a *plural* of *Aloah* or *Eloah*, as long as they hold to it, there will be no occasion for us to think of any other answer. Especially, as he says himself, p. 30, that *Moses* is one of those that are called *Aleim*, viz. *denouncers of a curse*: But there is no other singular for *Aleim* (*Elokim*) but *Eloah*.

Wherefore, inasmuch as *Eloah* hath confessedly it's *plural Elohim*, his arguing, p. 55, 56, built on an opinion that only *Christ* is to be styled *Eloah*, may be passed by at present, without giving ourselves any trouble about it. And the rather, because it is evident, that if his construction of *Alah* be unjust, as the Dr. hath enlarged upon it, he hath not been engaged all this time with the Dr. but pursuing the flying shadows of his own imagination.

He says, p. 58—"אלהים is never used for
"Angels."

“*Angels.*” But I have shewn the contrary, in my *Reply* to Mr. *Aboab*.

In answer to what the Dr. asserts—“When it is used of *idols* or false objects of worship, this *Idea*” (viz. *denouncing a Curse &c.*) “cannot be carried along with it,” he says (*ibid.*)—“*Idols* and false objects of worship cannot be called *God* in any sense that *Jehovah* is so.”

It is not the point, whether they may be *justly* called *God*; but why were they called so? If they were (as they really were) thought, by the *Idolaters*, to be *gods*, as well as the *Jehovah* was believed, by fidel *Israëlites*, to be *true One*; then אלהים must have carried along with it the *same Idea* in the *Idolaters*’s mind, which it did in the mind of *Israëlites*. But there was no such thing, that the *Idolaters* had been thinking of an *Idea* of *Cursers*; whereas their *gods* or *Idols* never did, or could, *denounce* any *Curse*. Then the Dr.’s Objection cited *p.* 59—“When it is said of *false gods*, that they are *not Elohim*, doth it mean only that they have *not sworn?*” is just and not yet satisfied.

To the Dr.’s other very just objection cited *ibid.*—“When it is said, the Lord their *Elohim*, He is *Elohim* of *Elohim*, and *Lords* of *Lords*: Although &c. yet *Elohim* of *Elohim* cannot import in either of the words *swearing* or *co-venanting* in any sense,” Mr. *B.* answereth by this query—“Why may not the latter word (viz. *Elohim*) mean *Kings* as well as *Lords* do so?—*Jehovah* is Lord of *Lords* and King of

“ of Kings; and *Denouncer of the Curse* on those
 “ who denounce it on others.” Tho’ I could
 say more than I design; but whereas Mr. B—
 answered to the Dr. as I think, *indirectly*; so
 I am pleased to reply *indirectly*, by way of re-
 torting upon him—He explains *Elohim* some-
 times to mean *covenanters*, or *swearers to a co-*
venant, and that to one another; sometimes,
 (as now,) *Cursers*, or *Denouncers of a Curse*:
 Then *one* word may have (as *Elohim* hath) *two*
 meanings; which is directly against Mr.
 H—n’s *Position* recommended p. 32, 33.

To the Dr.’s Objection cited p. 60, he an-
 swers—“ Why may not אל and אלהים (viz.
 “ *Josh.* xxii. 22) be construed differently, as
 “ well as *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, when the two
 “ words come together?” But *Jehovah* and
Elohim never can be construed in that manner,
 as *Al* and *Elohim* is here. Therefore the In-
 stance is not parallel.

What is that for (*ibid.*)—“ He supposes there
 “ is a difference betwixt the *Name of God’s Na-*
 “ *ture*, and his *proper Name*”? Indeed I can-
 not guess, whether he says so *in earnest*, or
Irony? If the *former*: the Dr. maketh also dif-
 ference, as it is plain from the terms, *common*
 and *proper*. If the *latter*: it is very unjust;
 worthy such a *Logomachus*, and *pursuer of the*
flying shadows of his own imagination.

Moreover, if according to this *Irony*, there
 be no difference betwixt the *common* and *proper*
Name of God; and (according to p. 61, l. 16.)
 “ *Elohim tzabaoth* may be understood, as God

“ is

“ is called *Jehovah of Hosts* ;” then *Elohim* (at least in this case) doth not convey with itself the *idea* of, either *swearing*, or *covenanting*, or *denouncing a curse*, any more than *Jehovah* doth, which certainly doth none.

Furthermore, Mr. B—e, asserting (*ibid.*) that “ *Elohim of Hosts* may be understood, as God is “ call’d—he whose Jurisdiction, or under whose “ Power or whose Property, whatever is called “ *Hosts*, most certainly is,” owns now what he was going to disprove against the Dr. viz. “ When *Elohim* is joined with &c, as *Elohim* “ of *Hosts*, it must surely mean his divine “ Being, be expressive of his Dominion and “ Sovereignty.”

Mr. B— still adheres to what he had insisted upon at the bottom of p. 54, and expresses his mind, p. 62, thus—“ The Word פֶּחַד used for “ God, Gen. xxxi. 42—53, the *Dread of Isaac*, “ expresses something not less *harsh*, than the “ Execrator” (I would say *Eloah*) “ whom “ Isaac worshipped and acknowledged for *Supreme*.” Nay, it is *less harsh*, since there is no *harshness* in it : for betwixt אֱלֹהִים to *curse*, or *execrate*, and this פֶּחַד there is so much difference, as there is betwixt, what the Divines call, *servile fear* and *filial reverence* of God.

I proceed now to p. 63—“ However, I shall “ venture to say, that ⓈⓈ is nothing at all to “ the Meaning of *Elohim*, i. e. the words have “ not the same idea or Meaning. If they had, “ it would be proper for the Dr. to shew it ; “ and when he hath done so, Mr. C—t’s Ex-
“ ception

“ ception shall be withdrawn; till he has done
 “ so, it may stand.” I never could wish a better and properer Contract, than this, whose *condition* (he thought quite impossible, but indeed) is very easy to be performed. Therefore, previous to my laying before the Learned World that small Contrivance I undertook in the *Originations of the Greek tongue*, I cannot but produce one *Specimen* here, in a matter of so great consequence. The *Arabic* אלה signifies first to *tremble*, thence to *regard with admiration and veneration*, and so, to *reverence and worship*. Also תוה (*Chald.*) signifies first *tremuit*, then *trepidavit*, so, *miratus, admiratus fuit*, &c. &c. Now both אלוה Eloah, and תוה theob (viz. both in *Pabul-Kal*) must signify, *Numen tremendum, uenerandum, suspiciendum, a Supreme Being to be feared, admired, revered and worshipped*. It is known that if any *Greek* word be derived from such an *Heb. or Chald* (&c.) word, which ended with ה or ע, &c. the last letter in the *Greek* becometh a ζ: So, I think, from תוה^a cometh Θεο, *Numen colendum, adorandum*. It is to be observed, that תוה *tremuit*, differs, in its *third radical*, from the *Heb.* תוה, *signavit*; as well as אלה from the other אלה. Now, I hope, Mr. B— is satisfied; and doth not desire any more reply to his pages 63—66.

^a I will some time hereafter enlarge upon it; and it is to be observed, that אלה *tremuit*, and תוה *tremuit*, in some respect may be distinguished.

How hasty he is saying, *p.* 66, 67—"The
 " Reply, that though אלהים be *plural*, it may
 " not have a *plural signification*, most certainly
 " came from one who did not know what he
 " was talking about." Now, I considered it,
 and venture to say (which, I hope, I do with-
 out the least danger of administering any oppor-
 tunity to the *Socinians*, &c.) that, tho' it (*viz.*
 when it is used for *true God*) have a *plural ter-*
mination, it may either have (however I do
 not approve of what Mr *Gittins* in his *Ans.*
 &c. says, *All Elahim*), or not, a *plural signifi-*
cation; since it is used to be construed with a
singular verb, and therefore I render *Elohim*,
 the *Deity*, or the *Being of Deity*, or *Divine*
Being, or *Ens adorandum*: as זקנים *seneſtus*,
 בתולים *virginity*, עלומים^a *adolescentia*, &c.

Page 67—"The definition of *αυτος*, that
 " follows from *αυτος*, *He that alone has Autho-*
 " *rity and Power*; and the other from *αυτω*,
 " *to exist*, may comport well enough with *Je-*
 " *hovah* either of them; but neither of them
 " with אדני, for אדני is not *he that alone has*
 " *Authority and Power*." He owns the *for-*
mer part: then I have to reply the *latter*, thus—
Jehovah, as he allows, is the *incommunicable*
Name of God; and *αυτος*, as he owns too,
 comports well enough with it: But yet *αυτος*
 is used to be applied to others too beside *Je-*
hovah: Why could it not then comport with
 אדני also, which is common to others too beside
Jehovah?

^a See my *Crit. Philol. Theolog. Dissert.* § v. *p.* 12.

“ And he presumes he might desire to know
 “ by what rules in the *Greek* tongue *κυριος* is
 “ to be fetched from *κυρος* rather than *κυρω*, or
 “ *vice versa*?” *Κυριος* from *κυρος*, and this from
κυρω; as *λογιος*, *λογος*, *λεγω*. *Κυρος* signifies both
auctoritas plena, and then, *auctoritas*, only; so
κυριος, beside its *primary* sense, *κυρων* i. e. *δων*,
 denotes both *auctoritate plena*, and, *auctoritate*,
praeditus. The former and the *primary* sense
 answers to *יהוה*, the latter to *אדני*.

To the Doctor's Objection—“ If we would
 “ have an eye to the Majesty of the Divine
 “ Nature—It would seem far more reasonable
 “ to deduce *אלה* to *swear*, and *אלה* an *oath*,
 “ from *אלה* and *אלהים* God,” he answers
 (*ibid.*)—“ If *Alah*, to *swear*, be borrowed from
 “ *אלה* God, then God and *swearer*, will come
 “ from the same *root*, and so the *Note* says it
 “ doth in *Arabic*, which is *giving up* the main
 “ part of the *Dispute*.”

Giving up indeed! I fully replied to Mr
Aboab, which I do not repeat here; only add,
 let Mr *B*— look upon the rest of the Do-
 ctor's words, and let him not be so rash, as to
 think the Dr would contradict himself; since
 he said *so* on this supposition, that, *if there was*
no difference betwixt their third letter.

Let Mr *B*— consider now, *how must he look*
upon this new invented derivation &c. p. 68, l. 6.

And I do not see how the Dr's *Note* on *A-*
rabic can possibly seem to make for Mr. *B*—
 אל in *Arabic* signifies God (also *jurament*, &c.)
 which is the same with the *Hebrew* אל God,
 which

which cometh from אלה *iuravit*, &c. but אלה cometh from, or is the same with, the Arab. אלה.

Page 68 says Mr B—"The difference of
 " an *Oath*, from an *Affeveration* consists, the
 " Dr argues, in an appeal to God, and taking
 " him to record." "But he that *swears* takes
 " not the Nature of God, nor his Sovereignty,
 " nor Dominion upon himself: He cannot be
 " said to become a God in any sense; by an
 " appeal to him, or making him his surety or
 " bondsman." What a gross conception is this!
most certainly he doth not know what he is talking about.

And he seems (in the whole p. 69) to be like a person out of his senses. But no wonder: because he was blinded, a good while ago, and misled by Mr H——n's *Position* above recommended.

Ibid. "Mr C——t's Argument to prove that
 " those Persons who created the world had be-
 " fore that performed an *act* which denomi-
 " nated them *Elohim*, is from its being said,
 " the *Elohim* created; which implies that they
 " were *Elohim* when they created." The *lat-ter* part is true: but in answer to the whole I say—*Our argument to prove that those Persons who created the world had before that Nature or eternal Essence capable of being revered and adored which denominated them Elohim, is from its being said, the Elohim created; which implies that they were Elohim when they created.*

From what Mr B— says p. 72—"The Covenant of Grace made between the *Elohim* was prior to the foundation of the world, and no Creature could be a *Party* there"; and p. 48, "The Oath of God is *relative* to his Creatures, and binds themselves (viz. *Elohim*) to us, and us to them": and p. 28, "The Covenanters bound themselves to each other for the performance of a Covenant or Contract": and p. 29, "Pronouncing those words, *Cursed be he* &c. and answering *Amen*, was the method of confirming and ratifying their Covenant &c;" I argue thus—If either of the parties be not present when the covenant is made, and he doth not give any way his consent to, he doth not at all bind himself to the other party, so the covenant is not ratified. The *Minor* and *Conclusion* follows evidently. What can Mr B— answer now? I myself will help him then, and without the least fear of my being obliged to yield—The *Elohim*, viz. the *Deity* itself was one of the Parties; and the other were *Men*. But instead of *Men* the *second Person* himself, the Mediator hath answered and given a consent. (To satisfy what is asked p. 50, *lin.* 37—). And so, in opposition to what is said p. 48, *lin.* 26, the *Deity* itself and the *second Person* our Mediator bound themselves to each other. But we must not think of this, according to Mr H——n's and Mr B—'s usual gross conception. Because there was no occasion for any *swearing*, &c. Dr *Sharp* is in the right, p. 41 &c.

○ In a Treatise by itself I design to discourse upon the *Distinction* betwixt אלה and נשבע : Now therefore I proceed further.

Page 82 is cited—“ נשבע, אלה : The latter “ only is used to express God’s act of *swearing*, “ throughout the Scripture”. Mr B— says —“ The contrary of which we have seen ”.

I must beg then leave to be excused, if I cannot see.

What is urged p. 84, l. 16— to p. 85, l. 18, I think, is answered already p. 60.

Page 86 is quoted —“ We are not sure whether אלהים, אלה signifies properly (— or) the Being that ought only *to be adored*.” (to wit, we are not all sure). Mr B— answers—“ Then “ we are not sure that there is a difference betwixt the *participle active* and the *participle passive*. אלהים is not *passive* ; *adored* is.” Nay Elobim is in Pabul (as עלומים, נעורים), tho’ the *Characteristical* ך is, as it often used to be, suppressed, as in גבהים, &c..

To remove what is urged p. 88—91, 93, is beyond my business and design : I hint only at present, that Mr B— is willing, p. 41, to confound אלה and אלה, saying, we give to one and the same verb אלה all these senses, *to tremble, admire, worship ; to bind, bind by an Oath, and to howl, to lament*.

Ibid. and 92, is cited —“ It was ungenerous “ in Goussset not to acquaint the *learned world* “ how this Art of *examining each word by the* “ *usage itself*, without dependance of any *Ver-* “ *sions*, Old or New, might be attained to.”

Mr.

Mr B— says— “ Mr H——n has been so
 “ generous as to acquaint the *unlearned world*
 “ with this Art. The Learned have no need of
 “ the Teacher.” But (as Mr H——n had
 need of a Teacher, so) Mr B— hath very much
need of reading the learned *Alb. Schultens's* Plea
 against *Goussertianism*, in his *Vetus & Regia Via*
bebraisandi.

Let me not, before I close my Remarks on
 אלה, pass what does look like an Argument, apt
 to be retorted upon Mr B—.

He said p. 76, l. 29—31—“ We from these
 “ texts (viz. *Luk. i. 68—* and *Heb. vi. 13—*)
 “ may fairly collect that the covenant of God
 “ was confirmed by Oath when first made.”
 Then we may fairly collect too, that God's co-
 venanting (viz. confirmed by an Oath) with
 mankind was made after the creation: which
 directly contradicts to Mr B—'s own Meaning
 at the bottom of p. 70, and to the reasoning in
 the book itself.

ברית

Mr. A—b translates the Word ברית some
 times *Purifier*, sometimes *purification*, and
 sometimes *victim*; and yet, in applying them
 to the contexts, he cannot avoid offering some
 misconstruction: And Mr B— renders only
purification (very seldom *purifier*: and when
 he doth render *purifier*, he taketh it for a *mean*,
 not for a Person, as Mr A—b doth); which
 he doth more properly, viz. according to the
 Rules of Grammar.

But

But that it cannot be rendered *purification* neither, nor carry in it any idea of *purification* (excepting *Jer.* ii. 22 and *Mal.* iii. 2.) I have enlarged upon in my *Reply* to Mr *Ab—b*, and shown, without begging, as evidently as can be, that betwixt ברית in *Jer.* and *Mal.* and ברית elsewhere, there is so palpable and remarkable difference, as there is betwixt *bôrith* and *bërîth* or *brîth*; the former being certainly deduced from בור, compared with ביר or באר, and ברר, and the latter from ברא or ברה, compared with ברו and ברי: therefore I need not repeat it here; and the rather, that in a Treatise by itself I design, as I made promise, to discourse upon it. (And so Mr *B—*'s Demand, *p.* 146, *l.* 12—15, will be satisfied.)

I shall then examine as briefly, as possible, what Mr *B—* asserts of ברית and כרת. But in the interim it is to be observed, he both in the preceeding *Head* and in this seems to be inclined to think that *berith* signifies *covenant*. Nay, he allows it *p.* 158, *l.* 29.

I pass to *p.* 101. *l.* 20—22—“*Carath*, where—
“ ever it is used, except with *Berith*, signifies
“ universally to *slay* or *cut off*.” But II *Chron.*
v. 10,, vi. 16,, vii. 18, by itself, signifies to *covenant*, viz. the same with *Carath berith*.

Page 102, *l.* 27—33 — “ If the Dr take
“ the advantage of this supposed Concession of
“ Mr *C—*'s, then he must allow that Mr
“ *C—* has produced *one Place* in Scripture
“ where *Alah* is used for *God's oath*; and he
“ must retract what he says *p.* 78, that נשבע is
“ only

“ only used for God's *aēt* of swearing through-
 “ out the Scripture. And a great deal that is
 “ built upon that Assertion falls with it.” And
 p. 103, l. 6, “ the greater part of his other *Dis-*
 “ *sertation* is overthrown”.

No such thing. You own, that the manner of covenanting was, they either *slain a victim*, &c. or *took an oath* and bound themselves, &c. (I add, a *writing* and *seal*). But you are in a mistake, if you think, they never could, or used to, make any *covenant* or *contract*, without doing either of them. The contrary of which is suggested by the Dr p. 138. So then both *Berith* and *Alah* might signify metonymically, *covenant*, without either of those manners being made use of. Moreover doth אלהו *his oath* (or *covenant*) imply God's *swearing*, any more than the *house of the Lord*, or *his sacrifice*, implies his *building* or *dedicating*, and *offering* it; since *Salomon* built the Temple and it was called *his*, and, because he *dedicated*, &c, to God, it was called *the house of God*; (so the *sacrifice* &c.): So *Alatbo*, *his oath*, is called the oath *both* of the people who has taken it, *and* of God, because to him it hath been made.

So there is no place for what is said in the top of p. 104.

Page 104, l. 8, 9, “ That ye should enter into
 “ *his* execration.” Then they, *before* they ei-
 “ ther performed or broken the conditions of
 the covenant, were actually *execrated*!

Behold, how favouring Mr H——n's *Posi-*
tion maketh Mr B—— offer so *senseless* a con-
 “ struction,

struction, *ib. l. 10*, “as, or, according to what
 “your God hath cut off with you to day”! and
p. 105 l. 1. “cut off a Purification”!

Ibid. l. 22, 23—“Ye should enter into the
 “Purification of Jehovah your God, and into
 “his Execration.” Doth it not imply a con-
 tradiction?

Because I am quite tired with meeting so
 frequently a *too literal* translation, I beg ear-
 nestly Mr B—’s patience to read my *Reply*
 to Mr A—b.

Ibid. l. 16, 18, 25—27, 30—“In various
 “instances אשר is the same as כאשר *sicut, iux-*
 “*ta, secundum, quemadmodum* — Take אשר
 “in the Place in dispute in the (same) sense.
 “The Dr will not call this an *arbitrary In-*
 “*terpretation* of אשר, for since it hath this
 “sense in other places, it *may* have it here
 “(*Deut. xxix. 12*)—(then) Carath doth *not re-*
 “*late to Alah*; and the Dr hath failed in his
 “attempt to prove that Berith *may in one text*
 “*be translated Covenant without any Idea of*
 “Purification annexed; and Carath *in another*
 “*be rendered to make, without conveying the*
 “*notion of cutting off.*”

But the other Champion insists that both
 Berith and Alah are governed of the same verb
 Careth. So Mr B— needed to have carried his
 quick eyes only to י 14, אֲנִי כָרַת אֶת־הַבְּרִית, הוֹאֵת וְאֵת הָאֱלֹהִים הוֹאֵת *I make this covenant and*
this oath. And so he hath failed in his Attempt
 to prove that Carath doth not relate to Alah;
 and therefore we call his interpretation of אשר,

in § 12, an arbitrary one. Consequently the *Difficulty is not got over.*

Page 105, l. 28—32, we agree.

Ibid. l. 34, he contradicts Mr H——n quoted by the Doctor p. 118, l. 3, 4.

I do not know, nor doth he himself, what he is talking about p. 106, l. 1—4—.

Page 109, 110, he speaks in such a silly manner (e. g. “Then the uninspired translation, “and not the inspired Text, would have become “the Rule of Faith, &c, &c.”), that I cannot help bidding him put the Hebrew text into the hands of, any illiterate, but the most zealous Quaker, or *Enthusiast*, and try what he could do with it.

Page 110, 111—“We may therefore see “reason to conclude that (in *Mal.* iii. 2.) “מְכַבְּשִׁים is not *fullers*, nor בְּרִית *soap*; the “words only saying, *the Purification of those “that wash or are washed*; all the rest (viz.— “Fuller—*soap* &c,) is the mere opinion of “the Translator, who hath no right to impose “his own opinion on another; &c.”, I allow Mr B— that no body hath right to &c. And is it not Mr B—’s mere opinion, that perhaps the inspired writers never used a *tropical meaning* of any word, or phrase, taken from the *fashion, manner, action, &c*, of any nation, *trading people, &c*, or from the *property, circumstance, &c*, of any trade, *action, instrument or mean, &c*, and consequently he must grant to me that he hath no right to impose his own opi-

nion

nion on another, but ought to leave it to himself.

Page 114—"The *purification* of those who were washed was *fire, blood, with cedar and byssop, salt, oil, &c.*"

I ask, whether any of these *means*, or even all of them put together, may immediately as they be spoke give such a clear sense or idea of *purification*, as the general name *πῶα, smegma, soap*, doth? Yet I say, if, amongst any nation, any well known *mean of washing or cleansing*, as the *nitre* (and *pot-ash*, which I take to be the *borith* in *Jer.* and *Mal.* as I began to discourse in my *Reply* to Mr *A—b*: So Mr *B—*'s complaint p. 129, l. 25 &c, I hope will be satisfied) and the *byssop* &c, be made use of; it is more proper to express it by it's own name, than by *πῶα, smegma, soap, deterfive herb*, or, as Mr *B—* would have (which is not so plain), by *purification*.

Ibid. at the bottom — "He shall be like the Fire *searching*, and like the *purification* of them that are washed." This I am not inclined to approve of at all; because, *first*, the *latter member*, as it is rendered in the *passive*, doth not so well suit with the *former*, and with the very context; 2^{dly}, in the *former* there is a *comparison* taken from an *instrument* or *mean* to *act* with, but in the *latter* it is taken from the very *effect* done or to be done in the *object*. Can it be said then, that *Christ* is *like purification of them that are washed*? 3^{dly}, It is more *expressive*

to use there, as we do, the *instrument* or *mean* (which is ready for executing the effect) than the *effect* itself. 4^{thly}, The *style* is not so *fine* and *emphatical*, and agreeable to the *Hebrew*, translated *too literally*, as *metaphorically*. And this is what *Schultens* urges in his, above mentioned, *Plea* against *Goussertianism*.

Page 117—"But what the Doctor means
 " by the Distinction, the *sense of smegma, soap*
 " or even *Purifier* in general, is not so true,
 " because the sense of *Smegma* is *Purification*
 " in general; and he makes a Distinction where
 " there is no *difference*." Nay there is. Is it
 not more general, if I say, *mean of cleansing*,
 than if I say, *soap*? for not only the *soap* is a
mean of cleansing. And *smegma* is a certain kind
 of *mean of cleansing*, which you cannot *purify*
 the *water, fire, metal, sugar, &c.* with.

How prettily plays Mr B— (*ibid. l. 22—30*)
pursuing mighty well *the flying shadows of his*
own imagination!

It is quoted p. 118—"If the context requires
 " that *ברית* should be twice rendered by a
 " *cleanser*; the context doth also in a great
 " number of places require that it should be
 " rendered by *covenant*, or *some word that is*
 " *equivalent*."

From these very last words of the Doctor's
 Mr B— is pleased to argue (*l. 18.*) thus —
 " Now, if cutting off a clean creature in order
 " to *cleans*e with its blood the Person admitted
 " into the Covenant of God; and bind Persons
 " by the hopes of that *Purity* or *Purification*,
 " to

“ to keep their contracts in matters of consequence, with each other, and making them
 “ One, by partaking of the same Blood, were
 “ customary, then *cutting off a Purification*, or
 “ slaying that which is to *purify*, is *equivalent to making a covenant*.” It is much the same to what I have answered in my *Reply to Mr A—b*. And I say of this *in general*, that it is *far fetched*: *In particular*; if it be *equivalent to making a covenant*, whether may these words, *to cleanse with its blood the Person admitted into the covenant of God*, be said of any *Heathen*, which ever *made any covenant* either with a *Believer*, or with another *Heathen*; since there are not few instances of such a *covenant* just declared, but nothing like a *covenant made with a God*: And *more particularly*; if it be *equivalent to making a covenant*, whether nevertheless it will stand with sense and reason, to apply it to the *brutes* also? For, *Gen. ix. 10*,
 “ *God establishes his berith* not only with *Noah*
 “ and his *Family*, but with every living *Creature that is with them, of the fowl, of the*
 “ *cattle, of every beast of the earth*.”

So there is no room at all for your flattering yourself so much, *p. 119*.

Page 118. l. 38—“ *Psalms L. 5, those that have cut off my purification by sacrifice*.” It giveth nothing more than *senseless sense*.

Page 124, l. 5 — So is כִּי a general word, “ and includes all the *Cleanfers* in Nature, and “ what is expressed by all the other words put “ together.” To the *former* I answer from the

Doctor's

Doctor's page 120—Yet “ בר (or ברר) is never
 “ used in Scripture, of *purification*, by a *sacri-*
 “ *fice*, or by any other ceremonial observance
 “ (though the Law abounded with such rites)
 “ but words from טהר and חטא. And one
 “ would have expected &c.” To the *latter* it
 will be sufficient now to answer only, that it is
 directly opposite to Mr H——n's *Position* above
 recommended.

Page 124. l. 31.—“ בר is applied to Words
 “ in making a thing *plain* or *clear*, to *declare*;
 “ not simply speaking or telling a thing, but to
 “ illustrate or make plain, *Eccl.* ix. 1. This
 “ sense of בר maketh nothing for them who
 “ interpret *Berith* with respect to *talking*; a
 “ Covenant is not an *Explanation* or *clearing*
 “ *up* of any point.” The first part we grant:
 and consequently this sense of בר maketh for
 them who interpret *Berith* with respect to talk-
 ing; a Covenant is an *Explanation* or clearing
 up of any point also.

Ibid. l. 29, 30, 39—“ בר is applied to
 “ Things or persons, either as picked or culled
 “ out, or which are without *spot*, or *blemish*,
 “ so perfect (add; *ab antecedente*, aut *a conse-*
 “ *quente*, aut *actv iam*). This *picking out* or
 “ culling, taking the best from the worst, if it
 “ do signify so, maketh nothing for them who
 “ fetch *Berith* from בר *selegit*.” The former
 we grant also, and affirm the contrary of the
latter. But by this and that we do not give
 up our derivation of *Brith* from ברא, ברה, &c.
 for tho' both ברר or בור, and ברא or ברה sig-
 nify

nify both *to chuse*, and *declare*, nevertheless they may have different Ideas. I do not dispute here, whether *to chuse*, be the primary or, as you would have it, the secondary signification of ברר; only suppose it to be *primary*; yet it may be distinguished from the leading sense of ברא, ברה. Your own assertion, *p.* 125, *l.* 5—8, and *p.* 148, *l.* 11—13, is of service to me—"I
 " *may chuse whom I will bargain with, and what*
 " *Terms I will bargain on, in many cases; but*
 " *this chusing is not the sense of בר, which is*
 " *culling out good from bad, i. e. cleaning*
 " *what is so culled out, separating from Mix-*
 " *tures, or taking forth the precious from the*
 " *vile."* The *first part* of which I take to be the *capital sense* of ברא, ברה, and that is in favour of what I have conjectured in my *Criticae Animadversiones*, § xiii. *p.* 22. But this, whether it may or may not be so, is not asserted in prejudice against what is quoted and said at the very bottom of your *p.* 155, 157, and 156, *l.* 10.

What I have quoted, a little before, from *p.* 124, *l.* 31, also helps me to make a distinction betwixt ברר, בור *to declare*, and ברא, ברה *to declare*: The first signifies, *not simply*, to *speak*, or *tell a thing*, but to *illustrate*, or *make it clearer or plainer*: The latter, to *say barely*; and this is enough in *making a Covenant*, wherein the articles are to be *declared* or *expressed*, tho' sometimes also *explained*.

And all this serves for an answer to *p.* 149, 150, and to the bottom of 156.

Page 125, l. 14—16—" I do not find that
 " ברה is ever used in the *Bible* for *cutting*;
 " ברא, which is another Word, is once or
 " twice construed so, and by *Elige* twice."

We do not make a distinction betwixt them
 any more than betwixt the *right* and *left* hand;
 and if a little more but so much, as betwixt
 the *taste* and *smell*.

Lin. 17—" There is no proof at all that
 " כנרת is from בר." Nor doth any body think
 so: but it is from ברה. Gen. xxxv. 16, כנרת
 הארץ about; or, but a segment, or parcel of
 ground.

The *Articles* laid down p. 126, 127, are al-
 ready either granted or answered. And before
 the *Consequent* of the 5th, viz. " That *Christ* is
 " expressly called *Berith*, the Creature therefore
 " that was his type must be a *Berith* in the
 " same View, though not to the same degree,"
 can be allowed, the *Antecedent* ought to be
 proved. Which is not yet done, that I know
 of.

Page 128—" We are as sure that ברית is from
 " בר, as we are that *purification* is from *pu-*
 " *rify*." Viz. בורית. But also we are as sure
 that ברית (viz. *berîth*) is from ברא, ברה, &c.
 as we are that *cutting*, or *slaying*, *chusing*, *de-*
claring, &c. is from *cut*, or *slay*, *chuse*, *de-*
clare, &c. See my *Reply* to Mr A—.

As for II Chron. xvi. 2, 3, Mr B— says p.
 131—" As they joined in this Ceremony (viz.
 " in cutting off a calf); Benbadad, as an hea-
 " then Prince, thought not of *Christ* in the
 " Sacri-

“ Sacrifice, as *Asa* King of *Judah* no doubt
 “ did”; and *p.* 132—“ This ceremony of
 “ *joining* in a Sacrifice was certainly understood
 “ to mean something more than going to a Sa-
 “ crifice *by themselves*; they purified them-
 “ selves in order to *make peace with God*.”

As I have observed above, there was in the
 Contracts or Confederacies no need always to
 make use of any accustomed manner or cere-
 mony of covenanting; so whether these Princes
 have made use of the pretended ceremony, viz.
cutting off a young bull, is very uncertain: So
 far then Mr B—’s contending for their having
sprinkled themselves with the *Bull’s blood*, in
 order to purify themselves, upon the articles of
 the Agreement, *is precarious*.

Further, it is even inconsistent with Reason
 to imagine, that, tho’ *Benbadad*, being an *hea-
 then*, did not think of *Christ*, &c, yet they
*joined and purified themselves in order to make
 peace with God*. Whether *each* of them with
his own God; or *both* with the *same* (viz. either
 with the *Asa’s* or with *Benbadad’s*)? The
latter cannot be said; because the Turk doth
 not regard *my God*; nor I *his*. If the *former*;
 then Mr B—’s manner of writing (*to make
 peace with God*) is as *obscure* and *improper* as
 can be. But the *former* cannot be said neither;
 viz. as it cannot be said that *Asa* joined with
Benbadad and purified himself in order to make
peace with God, because such an *act of divine
 service* (as Mr B— calls it), being performed
 jointly with an *infidel*, is unacceptable to God;

so would have thought *Benbadad* of his making sacrifice *joined with Aja*.

Then the primary end of their *cutting a bull* and *sprinkling themselves with its blood* (supposing they did so) was not to *purify themselves in order to make peace* each with his own God, but to make a *confederacy*, or a *league*, and ratify it in order to overcome the King of *Israël*. The *former* (viz. *to purify &c.*) perhaps might, or might not, be either *Consequence* of, or *connected* with, the *latter*; to wit, according to their having either performed or broken the *league*.

What is said above *p.* 119, 120, is to be referred hitherto—In order “to confirm the *co-*”
 “*venant* they made, they slew a Calf——,”
 “sprinkled themselves with its blood, so *puri-*”
 “*fied* themselves; so *reconciled themselves to,*”
 “and *made one with, God by the blood of Christ.*”
 Whether it may have place in *Benbadad's* *covenant* or *league*; Mr B— himself may as well judge, as I.

So far Mr B— hath failed in his Attempt to prove that *berith* carries primarily the Notion of *purification*.

As for *Job* v. 23, *Thou shalt be in League with the stones of the field*, Mr B— says, *p.* 133 —“It is a strange and forced Metaphor.”

Is it more strange and forced than what is *Psal.* xix. 1——4?

Ib.—“It is *unnatural* to talk of bargaining “with the Stones.”

“to

Is it more *unnatural*, than to *hear the voice* of what hath *no speech nor language*?

Ib. —“ It is seemingly unnecessary metaphor, “ for *what hurt do they do us?*” Not to complain against my good God, rather to *bumble myself*, I remember *what hurt they did me* more than once, when I was *five* or *six* years old: But, I hope, according to *Psal. xci. 11, 12*, my peace made with them will continue, both literally and figuratively speaking.

What hurt do they do us! O stony heart! O gross conception! Such a *Divine*! He puts me in mind of, that the *Divine* may be either *divine*, or &c. He thinks it is enough for him to preach, and read the prayers, in the *Chapel*. And, because he is *better* or *more pious*, than *Job* or his *children* were, he cannot be afraid, that a *great wind* would come from the *wilderness*, and *smite the four corners* of the *chapel*, or of his *own house*, or that any *earthquake* would cause it, or one small piece of its *stones* to fall upon him; &c. What would His Lordship, the truly zealous *Author* of that *Letter* written upon the occasion of the late *Earthquake*, think of such a *divine Divine*?

Right, this *divine Divine* means the *stones of the field*.

Goliath could not have thought, how he could be hurt even by the help of a *sling*. This *divine Divine* imagines, there is in *England*, according to his geography, no more *Rock* beside that of *Vincent's* over against the *Hot-Well* near *Bristol*; and he thinks, he may

avoid the danger every where else. &c. But metaphorically: He knows very well, he never will happen to meet with any *impudent Collector* or a *cruel highwayman* who would vex him barbarously, &c. Which, and such whatsoever, I wish to no body. Let all, especially the *Lovers of God*, be *in peace even with the stones of the field!*

So this *divine Divine*, not caring for our interpretation, is pleased to offer us Mr Gittins's most *easy and natural explanation*——“*With the stones of the field will be thy purification:*” to wit, God shall through that Purification mellow the barren ground thou sowest, and give thee fruitful crops.” The Original then, I think, would run more properly thus—*There will be thy purification* (not עִם, *with*, but) מֵאֲבָנֵי *from the stones of the field*. According to that Mr G——s's *easy and natural explanation*, the latter member of this *וְהַבְּיָשָׁה*, *The beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee*, could be as *easily and naturally* explained too, viz. when thou tillest the ground, the plowing oxen, or horses, shall obey thee! Natural explanation!

Ibid.——“They (stones) are on many accounts extremely useful; and where they lie too thick upon the ground may be picked up and thrown aside for use.”

Goliath's sword was on many accounts extremely useful to him, it might be picked and drawn out of its sheath for use. But how was it at last made use of?

Mr B— quotes the Doctor, p. 137—“ Or,
 “ if such Rite or Ceremony may be supposed
 “ (as what may not be supposed, when one
 “ hath a mind to it, that is not impossible?),
 “ yet it amounts to no more than a groundless
 “ supposition.”

And he objects—“ The *Note* and *Text* con-
 “ tradict each other, and therefore there seems
 “ some Reason to suspect that they are from
 “ different hands.—It is evident the *Author* of
 “ the *Text*, and the *Annotator*, looked diffe-
 “ rent ways.” I cannot see any such thing :
 Mr B— then ought to have shewn it.

The Doctor is quoted, p. 142—“ Now, in
 “ *Jer.* xxxiii. 20, 25, ברית seems to signify
 “ the same with חק, a *statute*.” Yea it is the
 same. See my *Reply*. And Mr B— says,

“ It seems somewhat unnecessary for the
 “ Doctor to seek for any other sense of *Berith*
 “ here than *Covenant*. Since God might as
 “ well make a covenant with the day and night,
 “ in the behalf of Man, as with the *Beasts of*
 “ the field, in *Hos.* ii. 18.”

It is true, *covenant* may stand there : But,
 since it is so widely understood, considering the
manner, circumstance, nature, course, effect or
consequence of it ; it is proper to express it
 some times, as now, *particularly* : whereas to
make ordinances and statutes is one of its consti-
 tuent parts, concerning the *circumstance* and
nature of it. And from hence arises the *idea* of
 the *statute* and *ordinance*, which God appears
 in *Jer.* to have appointed to the *Day* and
Night.

Night. (Let it be considered here, that בְּרִית, &c. the very root of *bērîth*, beside its *primitive meaning*, signifies also, *ordinavit, disposuit*). Then *Berith*, in *Jer.* carries along with it an idea quite different from that in *Hof.* which indeed arises from the very *effect* or *consequence* of the covenant, viz. the *peace*. This is to be compared with *Job*. v. 23.

Consequently, what Mr B— says—" I suppose the Doctor will allow that *Berith* is not ordinance or statute in *Hof.* because making a statute or ordinance with the beasts, is not Sense," is allowed.

Page 143 — " Making an ordinance with Day and Night." Not עִם *with*; but, making the ordinance of the Day and Night, in like manner as, what Mr B— himself owns, appointing the ordinances of Heaven.

Page 150, (157, 158, l. 4, 5) — " How the א comes to be dropped; or whether any one instance can be produced of the like derivation, as this of בְּרִית from בְּרָא is supposed to be."

What I have answered to p. 125, l. 14—16, may serve here. Moreover it is unnecessary to ask, whether the א sometimes is dropped, or whether א, ה, ו, י are changed into one another.

Ibid.—" הַמִּיר doth not occur, *Prov.* xviii. 19." But it doth xix. 18.

Ibid. " הַמִּיר *Isa.* xiv. 11, is in regimine, or the Genitive of הַמִּיר." The former is true:

But the latter cannot be: it is construed with *Genitive*, but itself cannot be *Genitive*.

I gave an account in my *Censurer Censured* (viz. *Reply* to Mr *A*—) how שְׁבִיחַ, בְּרִיחַ, שְׁחִיר, שְׁנוּחַ, חֲמִיר, &c, is for שְׁבִיחַ, בְּרִיחַ, שְׁחִיר, שְׁנוּחַ, חֲמִיר, &c. So, I hope, p. 150, and the top of 151 will be satisfied.

Page 151, l. 17—"I propose בֵּר for the *root*,
" and not בִּר, because one ר is as many as we
" want, and as many as usage gives it, in near
" thirty places out of the thirty odd the word
" occurs in."

True, it occurs with one ר in twenty-five places, wherein the latter ר is dropped; but it occurs also with two ר in nine places, and that in *Pabul*, viz. בְּרוּר, בְּרוּרָה, בְּרוּרִים: Then it is indisputable, that בִּר must be the *root*; because the *characteristic* of the *Pabul* stands always before the *last radical*.

(Hereby you may be put in mind of that אֲרוּר cannot come from אֵר, p. 82, l. 7; but from אִר).

It is to be recollected and observed what I have suggested above (and in my *Censurer Censured*), that any *root*, whose *two latter letters* are the *same*, is of the very same *primary signification* with another *root*, the *middle radical* of which is ו (or א, or י); and never with what ends with ה: So בִּר and בּוּר are the same, compared with בְּאִר and בִּיר. Consequently whe-

* So עֵל is the same with עוֹל and עִיל; and nothing like עֵלָה. And I beg here to propose my sentiment; which, as far as I know of, is quite novelty. I am inclined to think
ther

ther the latter ר in ברר, or the א, י, ם in the rest, be dropped, it will come to just the same. Had Mr, B— known this *rule*, he could not have confounded, *p.* 155, *l.* 15, שוב or שבב, (the *root* of שב *Deut.* xxx. 3), with שבה.

Ibid.—" I do not know whether the distinction of the *mutable* and *immutable* ה, in the first of these learned *Dissertations*, can be of any service to me on this occasion ; it is certain however, that the ה, in all these words produced by the Doctor, *p.* 108, is not *immutable*, and consequently not *radical* upon that account."

I do know, that it can be of no service to you.

Whether according to the Doctor's or your own opinion do you say— *is not immutable* and *consequently not radical*? Were the Doctor of this opinion ; there was no occasion for him to distinguish betwixt an *immutable radical* ה, and a *mutable* one ; only say, *radical* and *servile* ה. And if you *pursue* (here too) *the flying shadows of your own imagination* only ; you contradict yourself : because you said above, *p.* 14, 15, 20, and 150, that the " ה in אלה, גבה, לווה, ברה is *changed, or changeable*"; and yet, *p.* 153, *l.* 28, 29, say, that the " ה in them is *radical*."

How inconsistent also is Mr B— with himself *p.* 152, *l.* 1—4, compared with those two

that עולה, what we render, *burnt-offering*, is derived from עול &c, rather, than from עלה : consequently it is a *sin offering*, upon the same account as חטא and אשם. When the time requires, I will support my Opinion with arguments as far as it will be possible.

lines just quoted,—“ If the ה be ever *entirely*
 “ *dropped*, neither supplied, nor changed^b into
 “ any other letter, and this very frequently,
 “ what rule have you to make it *radical*^b by?
 “ —We may call the ה *radical* in ברה, גבה.”

He happened to drink too much of the *water*
of Forgetfulness; and he forgot already what he
 said above p. 15, l. 28—“ and another *Defle-*
ction or two might be brought, to shew that
 “ the ה is dropped in גבה.” I shew then in
 another Champion's Field, four places, at least,
 Ezek. xvi. 24, 31, 39., xliii. 13; wherein (ac-
 cording to Mr A—b) the ה is *dropped entirely*,
neither supplied, nor changed into any other let-
ter. To the same purpose Mr B— produces,
 p. 153, l. 19, תברני from ברה^c. Now I am
 mighty well pleased to put into form what Mr
 B— says,—If the ה be *entirely dropped*, it is
not radical; but the ה, in ברה, גבה, is *entirely*
dropped; therefore the ה, in ברה, גבה, is *ra-*
dical (or, is *radical* and *not radical*). Go, take
 other and better advice from *Esop*, because he
 misunderstood you the first time. Pray go again!
Mercury is ready at your Service!

From these *two contradictions*, which even
 Mr A— must allow to be so, let either Mr
 B—, or any Reader, judge to what doth that

^b This also maketh for the *first contradiction*; for it is sup-
 posed that though the ה be *changed into another letter*, yet it
 may be *radical*.

^c By the same principle, also what is said above of נאל from
 נאל, wherein the נ is *allowed to be radical and yet is dropped*
in the future, is contradicted.

pretty kind of arguing, *p.* 152, tend—" Why
 " do you suppose the ה (ever) dropped? Thus,
 " e. g. יבך, *he wept*, and תבך *she wept*" (I sup-
 " pose he would have said, *be, she will weep*);
 " why is בכה to be the *root*? Why not בך?
 " If ה be *radical* in בכה, then יבך and תבך,
 " &c, must be from another *root*; or from an-
 " other word which hath not so many *radical*
 " letters, and is without the *radical* ה."

And again—" Now either say that there are
 " two *roots*, בך and בכה, which both signify
 " *to weep*, or that the ה is not *radical* in בכה;
 " or shew us some rule by which the *radical*
 " may be supposed to be dropped; and till that
 " is done, this word (*viz.* בכית from בכה) must
 " be struck off the Doctor's List; and at most
 " will be on neither side."

*Now we say that there are two roots (not
 בך, but) בכך (or בוך, ביק) and בכה, which both
 do not signify to weep, only בכה (or בכי) doth,
 wherein the ה is radical: and Mr B— himself,
 as I have intimated a little before, supposes the
 radical to be dropped sometimes; therefore, not
 giving ourselves the trouble to shew what he
 himself supposes, we may justly vindicate, that
 that Word must not be struck off the Doctor's
 List; and is altogether and clearly on his side.*

Let Mr B— see now the evidence of his
conclusion, l. 17—21, and *p.* 153, *l.* 29—37,
 &c.

Page 154—" ברִיה is a *Noun* used for *meat*,
 " but never *Berith*."

The *stock* ברא, ברה hath several significations, which it disposes to its *branches*; so that, tho' all the *branches* may bear all the *notions* the *root* conveys with it (as *berith* certainly expresses to *chuse, ordain, declare, cut, eat*: for when they made a *covenant*, they were to *chuse* both *parties* and *conditions*, then make an *ordinance*, and *declare* the articles and their consent, then, in order to ratify it, *cut* animals, and *eat*: and this contradicts what is said *p. 158, l. 38*, and *p. 159, l. 1—3*), yet, each is used chiefly for one, particularly known, signification.

Page 157—"The *Versions* have but little "to do in determining this Dispute." The *H—nn* Version hath very much!

Page 158—"If the Doctor produce one single instance where *Berith* necessarily signifies the *Words of a covenant*, I will allow it "to have another *root*."

I wish I knew what this demand is for!

Page 159, *l. 1, 4*—"The Scripture is not "better understood by saying *Obad. 7. Men* "of thy confederacy, than (or, even not so well, "as) by, *Men of thy Purification*. The first "phrase only says, they were *leagued* together; "the latter supposes *that*, and tells you by what "act they were bound together."

Tell only both the phrases to any, not stupid, but sensible man, whether *English*, or of what country soever, in his own language; who either never heard them before, or is not acquainted with the Scripture at all: upon my word, concerning the *latter* phrase he will be

apt to ask, at least, four questions, as, 1) What is that *purification*? 2) By what act was it used to be performed *formerly*? and 3) How is it to be done at this time? 4) Who are those *men of thy* &c. are they *those whom thou* hadst purified, or *those who* had purified *thee*? whereas he would ask, concerning the *first*, at most but one, viz. how did they formerly make a *confederacy*? he shall know, I suppose, what is the present fashion; and that by the *men of confederacy* the *parties* are to be understood.

Ibid.—"The *Wife of thy Purification*, is as "good sense, as *Wife of thy covenant*." The other Champion renders it, *Wife of thy Purifier*, and he applies *Purifier* to God, and taketh the *Wife* to be the *Divine service*. But how *this* understands it, indeed I cannot guess, therefore I beg to be excused that I cannot answer at present: but this I can foretell, that he, whether he would be of the *same* opinion with the other, or in the *contrary*, will be caught both ways, and not escape for ever.

Ibid. is quoted—"Isa. xxviii. 18, *your agreement with Hell* (the grave) shall not stand," and answered l. 28—"but the Doctor could not "but know, that חזון doth not signify *agreement*, but *vision*."

I cannot but know, that it signifies *both* of them: for the *Arabic* חזון and חזי, the same with חזון, conveys with it the notion of *agreeing*, beside that of *vision*.

Ibid.—"They did not know what to make "of *Vision* there." They needed *not to know what to make*.

Page 160 is quoted (according to the H——nn translation)—“ I Kings xx. 34, Then
 “ said *Abah*, I will *send thee away with this*
 “ *Purifier*, or *with this Purification*.” And
 says the Comment—“ In the Original בְּרִית
 “ אֶשְׁלַח is, I will admit thee, or bring thee
 “ into a purification, (p. 161, I will admit
 “ thee to the purification. Not, I will send thee
 “ away with this purification, or, with this
 “ covenant, which are equally Nonsense, for he
 “ could not go away with one or the other).
 “ שְׁלַח is to send ; with מֵן it is to send from ;
 “ with בּ it is to send to ; and to bring into or
 “ send into.”

Bring or admit to, and send to ; very comi-
 cal ! Indeed שְׁלַח always signifies to send, send
 away, from (even by itself implies from ; and
 when מֵן is added, the place is determined, viz.
 from whence) ; it never may signify to bring,
 or admit, any more than this learned Commen-
 tator can both bring and send once one and the
 same copy of this book to some body, or, both
 carry one to Mr R——e and send the same
 at the same time to Mr A—b ; and yet say
 to Mr R——, see I sent you &c, and to Mr
 A—b, see (שְׁלַחתי!) I brought you. Now if
 our Commentator will be pleased to consider the
 strict meaning of this verb ; himself will laugh
 at this strange expression—I will send thee away
 to (or into) purification.

And let us see, whether it is Nonsense to ren-
 der so as we do. Benbadad says, The cities
 which

which ^d my Father took from thy Father, I will restore; and thou shalt make streets for thee in Damascus, as my Father made in Samaria; Ahab (catches at these terms, and) answers, (q. d. Done! Well! Go then!), I (send thee, or) let thee go (away) with this compact, contract, or covenant. To wit; be done so as thou dost propose. ב expresses here, *pro hoc pacto*, (*hoc pacto*) i. *secundum hunc contractum propositum*. The demonstrative ה, *this, the, that* (not after all prepositions; but) after the ב is always suppressed. There is an instance in the next Chap. § 8, 9, 11, Jezebel wrote ספרים letters; and sent הספרים the letters; and wrote בספרים in the letters.

Page 161 is cited—"Were the *victim* in a sacrifice at any time called *Berith*, yet the idea of *Purification* would arise from the *Fact*, and not from the *word*."

And Mr B— says — "But pray, what should hinder the Idea arising from the word; if the word signified *purification*, as seems to be allowed for the present."

Nay, it is not (nor even seems to be) allowed; otherwise you would make the Doctor contradict himself. The *victim* could be called both *bērîth*, because it is ברית or ברויה, *slain*, as I

^d I put here the Reader in mind of one fault in the *Preface* of my *Crit. Phil. Theolog. Dissert.* numb. III. p. x. I said there, there is not to be found, and sought for, in the *Hebrew* tongue, any, what we call, *Incident*, *Sentence*: it ought to have been added, "without אשר which": though, in other cases, its *ellipsis* is very frequent.

have intimated above (and in my *Censurer Censured*); and טהרה or &c, *purification*, because of its *effect*; but yet it could not be called בורית (as) properly (as טהרה, or &c.), because it doth not carry the idea of *purification* so high; and so much less could it be called *berith*, by the idea of *Purification*, which it hath not.

Page 162 — “ Who then could hinder us
 “ putting this idea in the *word* and the idea
 “ in the *Fact* together, since they are the
 “ same? ” The idea of any *Fact* and the idea
 in the *word* expressive of that very *Fact*, are
 the *same*, and can be *put together*: But the idea
 in the word *Berith* is not expressive of the idea
 of *purification*, the *effect* of the sacrifice; there-
 fore they are not the same, and consequently
 I *hinder ye from putting them together*, I.

Right, it is said, *lin.* 26, — “ It is the usual
 “ way of Scripture, and what Common Sense
 “ directs, to call the *Sign* and the *thing signified*
 “ by the same Name.”

I allow Mr B — and (*not to give up the whole Dispute at once*, as he flatters himself, *p.* 119, *l.* 5 — 15, and *p.* 182, *l.* 25) say — *Berith* is the *sign*, and *Animal* בריה, or ברויה, *cut off*, is the *thing signified*. So the Animal or sacrifice that was *slain*, is said to *purify*, or even may be called *purifier*, by an epithet taken from the *effect*: But doth it imply, that the mere name *Berith*, viz. considered abstractedly from a *victim*, must convey the idea of *purifying*? For instance, מים, טהור is a *sign*, the fluid liquor,

liquor, what we call *water*, is the *thing signified*: it is said to *wash away* uncleanness, or even may be called a *cleaning mean*, by an epithet taken from its *effect*: But doth it imply, that the mere name מִי or *ûdâq*, considered abstractly from the *thing signified* by it, should carry along with it the idea of *cleaning*?

Ibid. is quoted—"The Victim being an Emblem of the *Purifier* would convey all the important Ideas, without any help from the word *Berith*."

Says the quoter—"The Inference from the Doctor's Reasoning is naturally the very Reverse of what he makes. He concludes, that the Victim was not called a *purification*, because its being an Emblem of the *Purifier*, so naturally leads you to that idea;—let the Reader judge between us."

I myself presume to judge. You made that *because*, I think, out of *being*. I propose then the Doctor's Reasoning thus—*The Victim, because* (or *as*) *it is an Emblem of the Purifier, may convey all the important Ideas, (but) without any help from the word, Berith.* With what justness do you make such a Reverse—"The victim was not called a *purification*, because its being an Emblem of the *Purifier*"; or even could make such, as—*The Victim doth not convey the important ideas of Purification, because of its being an Emblem of the Purifier?* Beg your pardon, that I (which I justly do) call this *sanguineness* an *abuse* of *veness*.

Take then the Doctor's Reasoning—Whensoever we are thinking of a *victim*, as an Emblem of a person who *purifies* our Souls and Bodies, tho' we do not attend to (as if, suppose, we never have heard of) the word, *berith*; nevertheless there are immediately raised in our minds all the Ideas whatsoever may arise from the Antitype, or the *effect* of the sacrifice, or the end it was made use of for. Consequently I conclude—The *victim*, tho' it be an Emblem of the *Purifier*, doth not convey any of the important ideas with an help from the word, *berith*, any more than the *water* of the *Baptism*, tho' it be an Emblem of *Christ's Blood*, that *purges* away our sins, doth with an help from the word מים, or קטנט.

Page 165 is quoted—"Is there any reasonable proof to be given, that ברית is applicable to a Person otherwise than by way of Allusion, or Comparison, as in this Text of *Mal.*?"

Answers the quoter—"Yes; direct proof; see *Isa.* xlii. 6,, xlix. 8." Nay it is direct proof that ברית (as well as אור) there is applied to a Person not otherwise than by way of Allusion or Comparison; "I will give thee לברית for a Covenant of the people, for a Light of the Gentiles." (And let Mr B— not confound hereafter this ברית with ברית, viz. בורית, in *Malachi*. So what is said p. 167, l. 19—25, will be got over.)

Says he *ibid.* l. 19—"And it is allowed in the preceding page—That the sense of a Pu-

H

rifier

“ *fier will very well stand here, there is no room
“ to dispute.”*

Yea, the *Sense of a Purifier* may as well stand there, as *Isa. xlix. 6, I will give thee לאור for a Light to the Gentiles*; where there is no mention of ברירה. Moreover, allowing that the *sense of a Purifier may stand there*, we do not own that the word *Berith* conveys the idea of a *Purifier*, any more than, by allowing that the *sense of a Redeemer (&c.) may well stand there*, we should own that the same word *Berith* giveth the idea of a *Redeemer, &c.*

What in the *Doctor* follows immediately after this—“ Neither Fire nor Soap are otherwise *applied* here to the Great Refiner and Purifier of Souls, than by way of *comparison* and *similitude*,” is quoted, *p. 168*,—“ Just as *Coriander seed is applied to Manna*; as a *Flower is applied to a Man*; as *Milk or as Cheese are applied to the Person of Job*.”

And answers Mr B— “ Not *applied*; but *compared*.”

If I am not mistaken, that is the same as to say—*Not compared; but compared*. Either he pursues here too the flying shadows of his own imagination only; or he is not a very polite Master of his own Language. In the first part of the Doctor's words is, *applied by way of comparison and similitude*: and Mr B— thinks this, *by comparison and similitude*, not to be understood in the latter part, or would have it to have been repeated *three times more*: If not
I either

either of them; let him know, here are no walnuts nor rattles.

But let us see what is somewhat more material.

“ *Coriander-feed* is not applied to the *manna*;
 “ it is its *Colour*, which is compared to *that* of
 “ *Coriander-feed*. — A *flower* is not applied to
 “ a *man*; only the *shortness* of the *duration* of
 “ the life of man is compared to the *shortness*
 “ of the *duration* of a flower. — *Milk* and *Cheese*
 “ are not applied to the Person of *Job*. The
 “ Comparison is betwixt the *manner* of the
 “ *formation* of *Job's body*, and the *manner* of
 “ *making cheese*.”

Were I, like Mr B—, fond of *pursuing the flying shadows of my imagination*; I could also put my *Non-placet*, and make some (as) unnecessary criticism (as his) on those *three Consequents*: but I am serious, and say, as there is no room to deny *them*; so there is none to allow the *Antecedents*. If I say, *you are like the pursuer of the flying shadows of his own imagination*; how unnecessary it would be to say, *you are not compared with the pursuer of the flying shadows of &c*, only *your pursuing the flying &c*. is compared with *his pursuing &c*.

You might, in the same *sanguine* manner, reflect on what is said *Matth. xiii.*—The *Kingdom of Heaven* is like to a grain of mustard-seed; like unto leaven; unto treasure; unto a merchant-man; unto a net; unto a man which &c.

But to go on with the following pages 170 &c.

There is quoted, that *St Paul expounds* בְּרִית by αἷμα της διαθήκης, Heb. ix. 20 (*And our Saviour himself hath used the same expression, Math. xxvi. 28*). *And the Apostle hath actually altered the LXX* (which is a sign of his not having regarded it).

And says Mr B— “ *If St Paul hath actually altered the Version here, he hath not mended it* (which is what we say it was not proper he should), much less given us the exact sense of the *Hebrew*.”

He hath not given the *exact primary Sense* of בְּרִית, *in diuiso*; but he hath given the exact and usual (viz. secondary) sense of בְּרִית בְּרִית, *in composito*.

“ *He hath not mended.*” Nay, he did in this respect, that, for διεθετο, hath put another word more significant and emphatical.

“ *If he hath altered, he hath not mended, which it was not proper he should.*” Because of the bigotted Hellenists it was no less improper to *alter*; than to *amend*.

“ *The Greek word used here for Berith, is as proper a Word as any, or perhaps the best, in the Greek Tongue: it was in use; it was understood.*”

It not only, in general, is as *proper* a word as any in the *Greek* tongue; but, in particular, the best and properest to express what the inspired Writers meant by *Berith* throughout the Scripture.

“ *Διαθήκη* as much a *Misconstruction* of the *Hebrew*, as *Covenant* is of the *Greek*, and more so—” If

If you mean the very *primary* and *literal* notion both of the *Greek* and the *Hebrew*; true, *διαθήκη* doth not express the sense of *Berith*, any more than *covenant* doth that of *διαθήκη*. But we look a different way from you; and are surprised at this *Affertion* just cited, which is, I apprehend, impossible to imagine how it may be consistent with what you say again—" *The Authority of both Testaments is equal*;" compared with *p. 66. l. 23*—

Whensoever I venture to say, (which I very seldom do), that any *Greek* Text doth not correspond with the *Hebrew* it is quoted from, and if I cannot see at all any possible, or reasonable, way of reconciling them; I suppose, that Providence was either pleased not to deliver it to us as it stood in the *Original*, whether *Hebrew* or *Greek*, or not yet to illuminate men's minds to see the conveniency in it. *Plane non crediderim dari Tertium.*

Now the *conveniency* of *Berith* with *διαθήκη*, concerning the *secondary* sense they were used in, was seen and allowed some thousands of years before us; but as you put aside their *secondary* and that most usual signification, there will be *none*: and you oblige us to return you great thanks for discovering the *Misconstruction*, and putting us in mind of, and charging us with an error, *p. 179, l. 30—33.*

Alas! as the translation of *berith* in our copy is supposed now to be precarious, and indeed there are no hopes of ever reconciling its *primitive* meaning with that of *διαθήκη*; what shall we

we do with our *Misconstruer*, or, as he presumes to be, *Corrector*? He either will question the deliverance of the true *Original*; or say, the Apostle hath followed the received *Version*, which he did not think *proper to amend*, or even *alter*; *Tertium non datur*.

As I have such a conviction concerning the genuine original of *both the words* now under consideration, as to dare to say, they are not *precarious* any more than the whole Text itself *Hebrew and Greek*; therefore I suppose for the present, he will not question the deliverance of the true *original* concerning the abovesaid *two words*: he will then, as he really is inclined to, say the other. So I gather from his *p. 177, l. 10, 11.* compared with the Doctor's *p. 54.*

Now, as he allows, the *Authority of both Testaments is equal*, he must grant me also, that the *Divine Writers of the New Testament*, and consequently *this Apostle*, were *inspired*, and by *the same Holy Ghost*, as well as *those of the Old*; or else he will deserve Mr *A. Blackwall's* and other *Anti-Erasmians's* censure the severest: If they were *equally*, as they really were, *inspired*; he, by his paying so harsh a compliment to the *Apostle* as to reprehend him for misconstruing the *Hebrew word Berith*, maketh the *Holy Ghost* contradict himself, who ought so to direct the *Apostle's* mind, mouth, and pen, as not to disagree from the Prophet. How can Mr *B—* evade the imputation of *blasphemy*? Can he evade by his *hopes*, *p. 178, l. 32—*? Can he evade it by what he says, in this page,—“ Yet
“ had

“ had he (*Christ*) taken upon him to have
 “ formed new words, he must have wrote a
 “ *Dictionary*, or explained them by circumlo-
 “ cution”? There was no occasion to form
 here a *new word*; there was in the *Greek*
 Tongue a simple Word (*καθαρσις* or *ἀγνισμος*)
 the properest to express the *purification*; had
Berith signified it, as it is pretended, and had
 the Spirit of God intended it. What will our
Metaphysician do now with his *p. 177, l. 35*—?

*There is scarce an Objection that hath been
 used in the course of this Dispute that hath
 been more flourished upon, or more fully an-
 swered than this hath been; and which opens
 a wider Field for endless Contests about the
 Meaning of both Testaments, with several other
 Consequences pointed out.*

Page 173—“ The Doctor was aware of this
 “ obvious answer, that *Christ* might not speak
 “ in *Greek*, and therefore in the next page, he
 “ puts the Case himself”—*If it be said that*
 “ *Christ* talked in *Syriac*, and did not him-
 “ self use the word *διαθήκη*, I grant it.”
 “ Why then did he argue upon the contrary
 “ supposition, that,” “ *Our Saviour himself*
 “ *has used the same Expression αἷμα διαθήκης?*”

It doth not signify, what Language *Christ*
 talked in, whether *Hebrew*, or *Syriac*, or
Greek, &c: it is enough for our purpose, that
 he hath used the *same Expression*. Cannot one
 use the *same expression* in *English*, or *Irish*, or
Welsh, or *French*, or *Dutch*, &c?

Page 174—"Is not this setting aside the Old Testament, the original Record, as of little or no use?" "Christ *had* once said indeed, on a particular occasion, Search the Scriptures." "It is but *once*, and on a particular occasion, so not a general command."

It is not *setting aside the Old Testament*, &c; for *once* is used there not for *only once*, and so not in opposition to *more than once*; but in opposition to *less than once*, or, *not at all*. And *particular* there is not inconsistent with *general*. Cannot any Sovereign give, on a *particular* occasion, a *general Command* to all his subjects whatsoever?

Page 175 is quoted—"From observations on the idioms and genius of the *Hebrew* Tongue, then antiquated *in a manner*, and *out of use*."

Says Mr B—"Now quite antiquated and to be laid aside as of no use."

I am sorry to find he is so frequently either *abusive*, or a *Logomachus*. The Doctor doth not say *it was of no use*. I say, it was both *out of use* and *of great use*. And the Doctor doth not say any more, than you p. 109, *a dead Language*.

Must then any one, whether *Christian* or *Infidel*, think that the Doctor is laying a *stumbling block* in the way of the *Ignorant and Unwary*, and endeavouring to turn the eyes of *Mankind*, from the chief and principal evidence of their *Faith*? Consider it better early in the morning.

Ibid.

Ibid.—"He came not only to fulfil but to
" *explain* the Law and the Prophets."

Answers the quoter—"This is *gratis dictum*;
" he came *to fulfil*; but not *to explain* what
" was writ so plain before."

Yes; he came also *to explain*. See *Matth.*
v, xxi, xxii, xxiv, &c. He could not be said to
fulfil it in all respects, had he not *explained* it.
And if you will consider *Matth.* v. there is room
for the very *first metaphorical* sense of *to explain*.

Page 177 is quoted—"Just as the apostate
" *Jews* are *said* to have done since his com-
" ing." It is answered—

"I take the word *said* to be an error of the
" press for *proved*; because it is proved, *beyond*
" *all contradiction*, that they have used their
" utmost endeavours to mislead Christians &c.

Let me also take the omission of the word
much after *have used*, to be an error of the
press: I allow, it is *proved* they really did
much; but they are *said* to have done more than
they really did.

Page 180—"But *covenant* and *testament* are
" quite different things." Considering the pri-
mary sense of *διαθηκη* (and *testament*), they are
different things; but otherwise they coincide.

Page 184 Mr B—*dreams* and says—"They
" had no occasion to dream of a sacrifice when
" they stood over it; *in foederibus semper ali-*
" *quid exscindebatur*." To wit, whilst it was
in use; but after it was grown out of use, nor
even dreamed of, non potuit aut debuit *aliquid*
exscindi in foederibus.

Page 185.—“ But during the times of the
 “ Prophets there was no such change of Cu-
 “ stoms.” I suppose, not an entire change every
 where.

Ibid.—of Homer “ ἀπο σωμαχας ἀρνων ταμε νη-
 “ λει καλχω. The verb *to cut* used here seems
 “ to be the *Hebrew* word חָטַם or חָמַם *to finish*,
 “ *to consume*; variously writ in *Greek* τμαω,
 “ ταμω, ταμνω and τεμνω.” Nay, it cometh
 from חָטַם, or חָמַם.

Page 186—“ Because the Doctor will not allow
 “ נָרַת and נָרִית,” put together in composition,
 “ to bear their original sense, even where they
 “ are used betwixt *God* and *Noah*.” We allow
 them to bear some *idea* of their original sense,
 but not the *original sense* itself, always. So *p.*
 187, *l.* 31—must be satisfied.

Page 189, 190—“ But what the *figure* is
 “ they carry, or whence the *Metaphor* is taken?
 “ If you say it is the figure of the sacrifice they
 “ carry, then they are not *metaphorical*, but
 “ descriptive words.”

While and in whatsoever compacts it was cu-
 stomary to *slay a victim*; to *make a covenant*
 was not only *descriptive*, but a *metonymical* sense
 of Careth bûth; and since it was out of use;
 to *make a Covenant* must have been a *metapho-
 rical sense* of the same words.

To return back to some few *pages*.

Page 65—“ And this quotation of the Do-
 “ ctor's, *Heb.* xi. 16, is a pretty *clear proof*
 “ that *Elohim* doth not signify the *Nature* of
 “ *God*, but is expressive of some *relation*, con-
 “ *nection*;

“ *negation*, or some *contract* in behalf of those who should put their *trust* in him.”

Is there no *relation* betwixt the Deity *to be adored* and his worshippers? Is not God their heavenly Father in *faith*? Is he then not to be *adored* particularly by his children; (and *feared* even by all rational creatures whatsoever)? And is it not the *nature* of him, and of him only, that he should be adored?

(Page 106) I do not know how שלמי, *his peace-offerings*, Lev. vii. 15, can be even “literally, *his peace*.” By what a strange metonymy can also זבחים, *sacrifices*, II Chron. xxix. 31, be “*slaughters*”? Had the *slaughters* slain, or offered themselves for *sacrifices*; I would not have put this query. Moreover, yourself must own, when זבחים is a *participle*, it is to be read zôbbehim, or zôbbhim; and when it is not, even according to your rules, is to be read zabbbhim. Let any impartial Reader judge, whether the context requires to be read here zabbbhim, *sacrifices*, or zobbehim, *slaughters*.

Mr B— quotes—“The true and proper meaning of these words (*careth brith*) is not tained,” and, according to his usual manner of playing with words, answers—“If the words were *proper* according to their natural or radical sense, why do we not translate them according to that sense?” I reply in few words; *Heat is the proper quality of the sun, but it is not proper for all seasons.*

“If they were not *proper*, why did the Antients use them?” They were *proper* words, but

their genuine or *proper* meaning was not *proper* to be made use of (viz. in composition). So they might be used in a *proper* meaning, tho' not in the *proper* meaning; consequently, that there was any *impropriety* in the *Hebrew* cannot be said.

Page 117—"If the Doctor mean any thing else by *the same thing*, than the *same idea*, I apprehend he is mistaken, because *purification*, or *berith*, doth not mean the *thing*, but the *idea*."

Mr B—, I apprehend, is inconsistent with himself, for he says, p. 131, "Whether *purification* mean here (II Chron. xvi. 2, 3) the creature slain or the ceremony of sprinkling with the blood, &c." It means then not only the mere *idea*.

"If he doth mean the same by *thing*, as Mr C. doth by *idea*, which he seems to do by adopting Mr C.'s phrase—, then we are agreed so far, that *ברית* is not *soap*, but *purification*." Fair reasoning! It is like, if, when I would say, *אדם* conveys the *idea* of *earth* or *earthly*, he would conclude, then *אדם* is not *man*, but *earth*, or *earthly*. We say, *בורית*, because it conveys the idea of *purifying*, is a *mean of cleansing*, or even *soap*, &c. But to reply to both the *Is*: The Doctor by *thing* means both the *thing* and its *idea*, or, both *concrete* and *abstracte*. The *concretum* cannot be conceived without implying, or be declared but by, its *abstractum*.

Page 135—" I Sam. xi. 1, כרת לנו ברית,
 " Cut off a Purifier in our behalf, and we will
 " open our gates and submit to thee." If Mr
 B— asserts this *covenant* to have been to be
 attended with a *sacrifice*; the same difficulty
 recurs here as in *Benbadad's* covenant made
 with *Asa*. There might, or might not, be slain
 any animal. And consequently, to say, *cut off*
a purifier, is precarious.

So I think of many other, at present to be
 passed by, Instances are brought by this *san-*
guine Hutchinsonian.

Bona uerba, quaeso,

longa cum ueste sacerdos.

TER.

VIRG.

E R R A T A.

- Page 4 line 20 *Scriptuarian* read *Scripturarian*.
 5 l. 14 B— read B—'s
 6 l. 15 *jabbbotham* read *gabbbotham*.
 11 l. 17 השביע, dele the comma.
 54 l. 27 ברית read ברית
 l. 31, *Incident*, dele the comma.
 And wherever is *Alab*, *oath* &c. read *Ala* or *Ale*.

Shortly will be published by the same Author,

A Short Reply to Mr. Holloway's Few Remarks on Dr. Sharp's Dissertations &c.

And

The Censurer Censured, or, A Defence of Dr. Sharp's Dissertation &c. being a Reply to Mr. Aboab's Remarks.



